

REMARKS

In the Office Action dated January 5, 2007, the Examiner has newly rejected claims 1, 4-10, 13 and 16-21 under 35 USC §102(e) as being anticipated by Wang, U.S. Publication No. 20020159463 ("Wang"). In addition, the Examiner has newly rejected claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Harvey et al., U.S. Patent No. 7,054,924 ("Harvey"). Thus, all pending claims 1-23 currently stand rejected. The Examiner has further objected to the wording of the Abstract. Applicant has amended the Abstract to remove the information given in the title. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections of Claims 1-23, and requests reconsideration in light of the arguments as set forth in detail as follows.

Rejection of Claims 1, 4-10, 13 and 16-21 under 35 USC §102(e) over Wang

Wang describes a system that guarantees the uniqueness of a traffic flow between a client and one of multiple physical servers that share a common IP address. The server that accepts the connection request from the client advertises the flow information, i.e. the specification of the traffic flow, to an intermediate system in order to instruct the intermediate system how to forward later packets that match the traffic flow specification. The intermediate system, in turn, assigns a flow label to use on packets that match the traffic flow specification and forwards the traffic to the appropriate one of the multiple physical servers that share the common IP address. (See, Wang, paras. 45-58). In the rejection of Claims 1, 4-10, 13 and 16-21 under 35 USC §102(e) over Wang, the Examiner appears to be equating a specification of a traffic flow (Wang,

paras 45, 49), with a definition of how packets are constructed as recited in Claim 1.

The Examiner further appears to be equating the description in Wang of forwarding later packets that match the flow specification (Wang para. 58) with processing network traffic in accordance with a protocol runtime specification based on the definition of how packets for the protocol are constructed as recited in Claim 1. Applicant submits that a traffic flow specification that merely indicates how packets are forwarded is simply not the same as a protocol that defines how packets are constructed. The description in Wang is inapplicable to the problem solved by the present invention of adding support for new protocols to a network traffic generation and analysis tool. Accordingly, Applicants urge the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of Claims 1, 4-10, 13 and 16-21 under 35 USC §102(e), as Wang cannot support such rejection.

Rejection of claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a)

The Examiner argues that Harvey teaches writing a file in Extensible Markup Language (XML), and that it would have been obvious to combine Harvey with Wang to write the protocol file in XML as recited in Claims 2, 11, 14, and 22. The Examiner further argues that Harvey teaches determining from a file how to display a user interface element, and that it would have been obvious to combine Harvey with Wang to determine how to display user interface elements as recited in Claims 3, 12, 15, and 23. Applicants submit that such combination cannot support the rejection of Claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22 and 23, at least in part because the flow specification in Wang does not disclose the file that defines the protocol as recited in independent Claims 1, 13, and 21, from which Claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22 and 23 depend. Accordingly, Applicants urge

the Examiner to withdraw the rejection Claims 2, 3, 11, 12, 14, 15, 22 and 23 under 35 USC §103(a), as the combination of Wang and Harvey cannot support such rejection.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that the rejections have been overcome. Therefore, claims **1-23** are in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 5, 2007

/Donna Jo Coningsby # 41,684/

Donna Jo Coningsby
Patent Attorney
Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
(503) 372-1065

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026